THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 426. (Vol. IX.—43.) CHICAGO, OCTOBER 24, 1895. One Dollar per Year. Single Copies, 5 Cents.

A UNIVERSAL CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS IN 1900.

BY ABBÉ VICTOR CHARBONNEL.

(Translated from *La Revue de Paris* by Callie Bonney Marble.)

"I see already in thought the next Parliament of Religions, more glorious and full of promise than the first. I propose that we should hold it at Benares, in the first year of the twentieth century."

It was in these words that the Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones closed, two years ago, the Parliament of Religions at Chicago.

Everybody knows that it was a grand event of philosophic as well as religious importance. During seventeen days, in special conference and in public assemblies, in the immense Hall of Columbus, representatives of all the religions of the world peaceably presented their doctrines, embracing "the religious harmonies and unities of humanity, as moral and spiritual factors of human progress."

The Parliament of Religions dispelled the traditions of those conferences and councils, where of old the theologians engaged in controversies which ended in anathemas, revolts, and wars. It was truly a congress. The delegates of the various faiths had not to defend their creeds from ferocious attacks or against crafty critics. But by a loyal tolerance, without contradiction or conflict, all, on different days, had an opportunity of expounding what light their particular form of belief offered to man's intellect, which the problems of his destiny are disquieting, what support to his will, which unstable philosophies abandon to hesitation and incertitude, and lastly what exaltation for his heart, which mundane life does not satisfy, and which pushed hope beyond the visible horizon of the world.

It was the grandest event of religious peace and conciliation of minds that any century has seen. Old Europe comprehended it in the first news which arrived of the solemn opening of the Parliament of Religions. Cardinal Gibbons, before an assembly of eight thousand persons, with his gentle presence, rose in the purple of the cardinal, amid the varied costumes of a hundred and seventy representatives of the principal religious bodies, his eyes radiant with celestial joy, and in the silence of the sanctuary recited the words of "Our Father, who art in heaven," and all joining recognised this as the "universal prayer."

Was it possible for such an event to be repeated? Could there not be held in the same spirit of tolerance and liberty, but more complete, a new Congress of Religions, which would be truly universal? This wish was upon all lips when the delegates separated. Regret would live in their hearts if they were forced to say that on one day only men had met in a bond of fraternity with God, and that, dispersing, the old "denominational walls," to quote the words of a well-known prelate, would again be reared to the skies. Some men of noble wish have sought to renew the work of religious unity and intellectual fraternity of the Parliament of Religions. Catholics, Protestants, representatives of various Christian faiths, of Israelite worship, and even of Oriental worship, are endeavoring to gain the support of all adherents of tolerant creeds and of all freethinkers for the idea of a universal Congress of Religions to be held in Paris in 1900, during the next universal exposition.

* * *

A Universal Congress of Religions at Paris in 1900! Already I see the light race of humorists imagining to themselves all sorts of consecrated parades, variegated shows of costumes and tinsel, theatrical representations of rites, a pontificial tournament of Protestants and priests. They deceive themselves. The neo-Buddhists will not experience there the mysterious emotions which were excited in them at the Esplanade des Invalides, by the ceremonies of the Temple of Buddha. The frequenters of the Musée Guimet will be disappointed. No *impresario* will show lamas or fakirs. They will not have there the invocation of the lotus, or offering to the "Trois Joyaux."

Some journals have tried to launch the project of "a universal and international history of Christianity during the last nineteen centuries." The temple at Jerusalem would be reconstructed. A panorama would represent the various evangelical countries. Something like a tableau of Gerome would depict the Coliseum with Nero, the beasts, and the martyrs. Then the crusades, then Lepanto, and even a council, or a pontifical office in Saint Peter's. And in this comedians would play the "mysteries" of the Middle Ages, and

the peasants of Oberammergau "The Passion." All of which would well be worthy the famous "Street in Cairo." But is it necessary to say a religious congress would have nothing to do with such a scheme of panorama and opera comique?

A Congress of Religions should not even be a congress of scholars, who would expose the history of dead religions, the religious life of the past, the evolution of beliefs, or the actual religious idea among the barbarous countries. These might interest the savants and psychologists. They scarcely touch the minds of the people who reflect principally upon the conditions of moral and social life for present humanity.

* * *

The Universal Congress of Religions should be a congress for accurately expounding the religious idea, a congress largely apologetic in its nature.

"We believe," wrote the Rev. Dr. Barrows, in a letter in which he submitted to the various religious bodies the project of a Parliament of Religions, "that God exists, and that nowhere is he without testimony. We believe that the influence of religion tends to advance the general welfare, and that it is the first factor in social organisation. . . . We propose to examine the foundations of religious faith, to review the triumphs of religion in all ages, its position with all the different nations, and its influence on literature, the fine arts, commerce, government, and family life; to show the power of religion in promoting temperance, social purity, and its harmony with true science; the importance of a day of rest—in a word, to contribute to those forces which will bring about the unity of the race in the worship of God and the service to man."

During the Parliament of Religions, this programme was carried out, and it was in this spirit that the orators of the various faiths treated the following grand subjects: "God, his existence and attributes; universality of the belief in God; Man, his origin, nature, soul, and destiny; Religion, the relation between God and man; the needs of humanity satisfied by religion; the systems of religion, or comparative study of religions; the chief religions of humanity; the sacred books of the world;—finally, the relations of religion to morals, to the family, to civil society, to social problems, to the love of humanity, to the arts and sciences."

These are the questions of all time, and the Congress of Paris also will take them up.

We need not lay down in advance a rigorous plan for this Congress, which cannot be realised save by the co-operation of all. One thing only is of importance to state; viz. in what spirit of friendliness and religious union our savants and thinkers will have to assemble. Their duty will be to extricate from the numerous forms which the religious idea has assumed among the peoples of the world, and from the dogmatic symbols in which they are expressed, what is permanent and universal in this idea.

The majority of men meet in a belief in the Divine, in a faith in God, which they affirm by their devotions. This God they regard as the Father and Judge of mankind. And if this notion was for a long time confused among the Orientals, it has day by day been more and more clarified by Christianity. Professor Bonet-Maury, in a remarkable article on the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, has shown that the Oriental religions are making rapid evolution toward the Christian ideal. Monotheism is the faith of the world. And it seems as if all humanity would some day be united in a supreme religion, the religion of the *Fatherhood of God and the Fellowship of Man.*

From this religion a moral law is deduced which places *en rapport* God and man, and men with each other. Whatever may be the differences of application in practical cases, the existence and consciousness of this law are a universal fact. And always, with all people, a necessary relation of cause and effect, of principle and consequence, is established between the religious sentiment and the moral sentiment, between the faith and the rule of life.

It is on such unanimity, which recognises God as father, and all men as brothers, and on that duty which springs from the fatherhood of God and the fraternity of man, that a religious congress should set its solemn seal; and not on diversities of doctrines, or formalities of sectarian creeds. Now, the religion of the fatherhood of God and the fraternity of man is only the religion of the Gospel. At Chicago, Brahmans and rabbis proclaimed Jesus Christ "the true Saviour of humanity," and his Word "the foundation of all the religions of the world." Bishop Keane said: "All the means which serve the All-High to unite man culminate in Jesus Christ. The great religious leaders of the world were only the forerunners of the aurora which should be the light of the world. Christ will be the centre of religion forever."

But how shall Christianity draw to itself in unity the diverse creeds of the world, if she herself is divided? Christ has said: "There shall be one fold and one shepherd." Christians have broken this unity. Little by little, and from various motives, deep separations have been caused. The dividing of the Christian family is the greatest crime against the Gospel. The Congress of Religions, where mainly representatives of Christianity will stand, should seek to recover that unity of Christ. As Canon Freemantle of Baliol College, Oxford, has said: "It is unity of spirit, that is, sympathy on certain subjects, which will lead to co-operation. Faith in its true form is less the adherence of the intellect to certain dogmas than a moral and sympathetic faculty. We should apply this fac-

ulty, not to dogmatic symbols which we devise, but to those objects of religion on which we are unanimous—God, Christ, and Eternal Life."

The last two days of the Parliament at Chicago were consecrated to the study of grave problems—first, religious union of all the human family; and, secondly, religious union of Christianity. It was a noble sign of the times, that such subjects, the mere statement of which indicates a remarkably generous impulse of the human mind, should be presented to an assembly of believers. The universal congress will regard it as its highest aim to revert to these subjects, and affirm a new spirit, truly evangelical, of charity and union.

But union is not fusion. Not one sacrifice of faith will be asked, no tacit abandonment of convictions, nor vague compromise with conscience. "We ask no one to renounce his beliefs," said Mr. Charles Bonney, President of the general assembly, in his greeting of welcome to the members of the Parliament at Chicago; "here the word 'religion' signifies love and worship of God, love and service of man. We would wish to unite all religions against irreligion, and all meet in fraternity for the public good to advance charity and mutual respect."

At the next Congress, the representatives of each religion will be free, in the special congresses, to set forth their creeds and the doctrinal interpretation which they have given them. And at the same time a scientific section will be established, where, in the ordinary manner of learned congresses, the statements of each religion on points of dogma, critical exegesis, history of beliefs, of morals and social justice, will be presented in essays, discourses, and discussions. But in the solemn sessions which will properly constitute the Congress no controversy will be permitted. By successive representatives the different churches or societies of believers will declare their solutions of the problems of man's final destiny, and of the moral and social life, which are now chiefly agitating humanity.

* * *

The first result to be expected of a religious congress is the restoration of the religious idea. Why is the intellectual and social movement of the world being effected outside the Church? It is because, in the words of Bishop Ireland, "the ministers of Christ have withdrawn into the winter quarters of their own sanctuaries and sacristies." It would seem as if religion had no longer anything to say to the world, and as if it were fleeing, in a sort of confession of weakness, from the disagreeable test of opposition. But if religion will come out of this somnolence of its catacombs, if it will appear before the people, and offer to them the doctrine without the unpopular paraphernalia of an authority which would seek merely to impose, it would be astonishing if souls remained hostile to its instruction while there are so many needs, so many anxieties calling for divine comfort.

No other moment will human thought find more favorable for the restoration of the religious idea. All minds now are occupied with social problems. As these problems touch all the conditions of life, they appeal to the simple and the profound. New times are announced by philosophies, by statesmen, and poets of evolution. The old society crumbles, we say. A new society is forming in the aspirations of men, and the hour approaches when it will mount upon the ruins of the past. But what will that society be if life is regulated only by confused dreams of social revolution or anarchy? Criticism may contest the religious sentiment, and revolt against its oppressive dictations. It remains none the less true that religion has formed the soul of humanity in the past, that that humanity has thought and lived religiously, that thus a general fashion of education has become prevalent, and that a hereditary stock of ideas has thus been formed, of which it is imperative to take account in all dreams of social reorganisation.

From this it appears that the social question is pre-eminently a moral question, and that necessarily involves the religious question. The present conditions, then, are peculiarly favorable to what may be called the moral and social test of religion.

* * *

Christianity, and especially the Catholic Church, is in the act of making this test. "Religion," said Carlyle, "is a living thing and therefore moving." Religion must adapt itself to the needs that each day awakens. Though doctrines are immutable in their essence, there is nevertheless a development, and, in a certain sense, even an evolution of doctrines, in virtue of the interpretation which applies them to changing circumstances. At the present hour, then, Christianity has set for its work and apologetics a social aim; it is proclaiming among modern peoples the democratic spirit of the Gospel; it is reviving the obligations of charity, justice, and piety. By the example of its great Pope, the Catholic Church is a veritable leader in social movements. Its theologians and orators are seeking practical means of bringing about a more just social order.

Social reformers lay down for the solution of the social problem, scientific rules, which, being established upon the analogies of natural history, only reach the animal nature of man. Socialists lose themselves in a Utopia of universal happiness by the absorption of the individual in the State. Anarchists aim at individual development, whose unrestrained liberty destroys all society. Both propositions are chimerical.

Christianity recognises the partly just aspirations

which are blended in these chimeras. But, to cure the imagination of man of preposterous illusion, it widens the range of our earthly vision and turns our minds to the mysteries of eternal hope.

When, then, the Christians of the Congress of Religions shall say what they accept of the social movement, what curb shall be put upon its excesses, no mind can deny the importance of such a declaration. And it is believed that the teachings of Christ, loyally presented in all their democratic sincerity, will touch the hearts of all who seek a religion of "human solidarity." But especially the humble will feel the divine pity of Christ, alive in all his true believers, when a great assembly of Christians shall repeat on high the *misereor super turbam.*

* * *

"At Benares, in the first year of the twentieth century," said the Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

That name of Benares, of the holy city of the Brahmans, of the city of gold, resting upon the trident of Siva, might come to the thought of a clergyman, moved by the farewell speeches of the last session of the Parliament of Religions. But it was sentiment.

After the United States, it is France, that other land of tolerance and liberty, where we look to see produced the most magnificent tribute which has ever been rendered to the liberty of conscience. It is in the centre of a learned civilisation, in the face of academies which will subject them to the most rigorous criticisms, that the religious bodies should form their holy line, and proclaim, against all positivistic or materialistic negations, the indestructible law of the mystical phenomena. And, finally, it is in this most ancient and glorious branch of Christianity that the grandest religious conclave of all the centuries should assemble. After the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, the Universal Congress of Religions at Paris!

The date chosen will be that of the Universal Exposition, where will be glorified the marvels that the energy, art, and genius of man have produced. Here the religious idea will be represented and expounded by an assembly of believers. Is it not plain that religion accepts as beautiful and valuable all the victories of science, only defending against scientific positivism or materialism the higher ideas of the soul, of a moral ideal of God?

* * *

To avoid the inevitable objection from the timid and sceptical, "A Congress of Religions for all the world," the unbeliever will say, "is good for America, a new country without history, but not for Europe." It is true that all that Europe has had in the past religious troubles, the remembrance of which is guarded by prejudice and sectarian bonds. Spiritual power, by long tradition, has acquired the habit of domination and of exclusion. Will all be forgotten in an outburst of reconciliation? What was possible in the country of Channing—will it be so in the land of Calvin? and will Catholics, Protestants, and Jews not find themselves embarrassed by a meeting which follows so closely on the dissensions of yesterday?

We reply, It would be doubting the efficacy of the Gospel of peace and love to believe that approach between Christians is impossible. Irreligion is at our doors. We have more important things to accomplish than to quarrel. And, when irreligion seeks to destroy the Christian heritage, we must save the least fragment, wherever it be, must gather as a necessary reserve the least crumb falling from the table where are seated the disciples of the Christ.

The sectarians, and I mean thereby the sectarians of faith, have an objection even more grave. They contest the principle even of a Congress of Religions. Recognition to all forms of religion, according to dogmatic tradition, would be a slight to "the only truth in the one Church," and might imply the heretical idea "that all religions are good and of equal value."

A Congress of Religions is a reunion of men of various beliefs, where each has the right to present his faith, where all admit the value of incomplete truth, and where they credit even error with good faith and sincerity.

A Congress of Religions is a congress of religious men. Neither the deficiencies of one belief nor the superiority of another are denied. Nothing is affirmed by the fact of a congress as to the absolute value of the credos. Our purpose is less to compare their absolute or objective value, than to recognise their relative and subjective value. The religions will be considered from a human standpoint. They will be considered less as abstract doctrines than as an element of moral personality, and the issue will be not so much creeds and truths as the sincerity of the believers.

* * *

The Catholic Church should make to this grand idea of a universal congress the most generous concessions.

In the Parliament at Chicago, in a Protestant country, the first place and rôle was given to the Catholics. "In all the assemblies," said Bishop Keane, "the originators of the Congress expressed, by a unanimous voice, not only the desire to receive the counsels of the Church, but to be guided by them. They asked our opinion on the choice of subjects to treat, and introduced into their programmes modifications which we suggested to them. In order to study religion under all its aspects and in all its relations to human life, it was decided that the Congress should convene seventeen days, each day devoted to a subject of general interest. The commission decreed that at

least one Catholic delegate should be heard each day. It was arranged in the beginning that a series of conferences should be held simultaneously with the regular congresses, where each religion should have a day to expound its doctrines, and the Catholic Church held in these the first place. Lastly, Cardinal Gibbons was asked to open the Congress by a prayer and a discourse.

This full and respectful deference permitted him to appear in this memorable assembly without any sacrifice of his dignity or divine rights. And the great prelate rendered as follows his judgment upon the work at Chicago: "Thus for seventeen days the Church held its place in the midst of this singular assembly, as did St. Paul of old in the midst of those who questioned him in the Areopagus. They listened with respect, often with enthusiasm and applause, which formed a consoling contrast to the distrust and sectarian rancor of the past centuries. What will be the result? Who can say, except the God of goodness, who gives all blessing! Amiable critics, who find nothing good save in the stereotyped dogmas of the old *régime*, will undoubtedly expect only evil from the new step. They believe that the Church lowers itself in having appeared in the midst, not only of the faithful, but of the unbelievers. As to the beloved Master, who has said that his Church should produce in the great day "new treasures as well as old," and who made her, according to St. Paul, the debtor of all those who were wandering afar from her in search of the truth, he will not fail to judge all aright. It is for him alone that the work has been undertaken and performed."

To the Protestant Church belongs the honor of having taken the initiative in the Congress at Chicago; but it can be said that its success depended very largely upon the adhesion of the Catholics. Among the Catholics it needed the powerful authority of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland to win over the timid ones.

"The Congress at Chicago is the most beautiful and happy event in the whole history of our young Church in America," said Cardinal Gibbons. The Church of France can do what the Church of America has done, and be sure of the same advantages; and, since it is an act of generosity, or, if you will, of courtesy, she should bestow on the enterprise the good graces of her full co-operation.

* * *

The idea of a Universal Congress is already more than a hypothetical project. It has been submitted to the criticisms of the great prelates of the Catholic world. Cardinals, bishops, theologians, editors of journals, savants, and writers have given their opinions. Suffice it to say that a universal congress of unity has the approbation and effective support of two French cardinals. M. Bonet-Maury, professor of a Protestant theological faculty, and delegate from Protestant Europe to the Parliament at Chicago, has secured the co-operation of the reformed churches of France. The Grand Rabbi Zadoc Kahn has communicated by official letter his support and that of the Israelite consistory.

When the union of the three great cults of France was thus effected, a testimonial was sent to the Pope in the name of a number of Catholics, with this title: "Memoir on the Project of a Universal Congress of Religions at Paris in 1900." Cardinal Gibbons, going to Rome, consented to present this memoir.

When the Parliament of Religions was opened at Chicago, by the prayer that Cardinal Gibbons offered, much astonishment was felt in France and Rome, and even indignation; all expected an official act of disapproval and condemnation. The condemnation did not come. The Pope gave his sanction. Ever afterwards whenever visitors recalled to Leo XIII. the remembrance of the Parliament of Religions, his deep, clear eyes beamed with joy. He had seen a little of his dream realised—the Pope of the people, the reconciliation of society through evangelical justice; the union of the churches in the universal peace among men.

A few days ago we asked Cardinal Gibbons, on his return from Rome, what his impressions were in the matter. They were as follows: The Pope will not convoke officially a Congress of Religions. He wishes to leave free the initiative to Catholics, and in this manner leave this grand idea to their patronage. Above all, he does not wish to engage in the organisation of a congress which should bring together all religious faiths, the prestige of his person and authority as head of the Church. But to us the Cardinal declared:

"Write, act, do not be timid in France. Interest in your project those who think, those who believe. Create a strong movement of public opinion. The Pope will be with you. Of that I am sure."

PERSIAN DUALISM.

RELIGION in its origin is based upon the fear of evil, and by evil the primitive man understands that which hurts him, or that which is unpleasant. Says Tylor (*Primitive Culture*, Vol. II., p. 318):

"This narrow and rudimentary distinction between good and evil was not unfairly stated by the savage who explained that if anybody took away his wife, that would be bad, but if he himself took someone's else, that would be good."

Whenever man, in the course of his moral evolution, begins to discover that that which gives him pleasure, or appears to him good, is not as yet *the* good, that *the* good, viz., the morally good, is much higher and greater than the pleasurable, that it is a

power in the world which to struggle for is his main duty in life, he becomes civilised. And among the nations of antiquity, the Persians seem to have taken this step with conscious deliberation, for they most earnestly insisted upon the contrast that obtains between good and evil, so much so that their religion is even to-day regarded as the most consistent form of dualism.

The founder of Persian dualism was Zarathuśtra, or, as the Greeks called him, "Zoroaster."

Zarathuśtra, it is rightly assumed, was not so much the founder of a new era, as the concluding link in a long chain of aspiring prophets before him. The field was ripe for the harvest when he appeared, and others must have prepared the way for his movement.

Zarathuśtra is in all later writings represented as a demi-God, a fact which suggested to Prof. Darmesteter the idea that he was a mythical figure. Nevertheless, and although we know little of Zarathuśtra's life, we have the documentary evidence in the "Gathas" that he was a real historical personality.

The Gathas are hymns written by Zarathuśtra; in which he appears as a struggling and suffering man, sometimes elated by the grandeur of his aspirations, firmly convinced of his prophetic mission, and then again dejected and full of doubt as to the final success of the movement to which he devoted all his energies. Says Prof. L. H. Mill, the translator of the Gathas.

"Their doctrines and exhortations concern an actual religious movement taking place contemporaneously with their composition; and that movement was exceptionally pure and most earnest.

"That any forgery is present in the Gathas, any desire to palm off doctrines upon the sacred community in the name of the great prophet, as in the Vendidad and later Yasna, is quite out of the question. The Gathas are genuine in their mass."

There were two religious parties in the days of Zarathuśtra: the worshippers of the daêvas or nature-gods, and the worshippers of Ahura, the Lord. Zarathuśtra appears in the Gathas as a priest of the highest rank who became the leader of the Ahura party. Zarathuśtra not only disparaged the old nature gods, but as we shall see, he also regarded them as representatives of a fiendish power which he called *Drûj*, i. e. falsehood, and *Angrô Mainyush*, or *Ahriman*, which means "the evil spirit."

Zarathuśtra taught that Ahriman was not created by Ahura but possessed of an independent existence. The evil spirit, to be sure, was not equal in dignity to the Lord, nor even in power; nevertheless, both were creative and both were original in being themselves uncreated. They were the representatives of contradictory principles. And this doctrine constitutes the dualism of the Persian religion which is most unmistakably expressed in the words of the thirtieth Yasna.[1]

[1] See *Sacred Books of the East*, XXXI., p. 29.

"Well known are the two primeval spirits correlated but independent; one is the better and the other is the worse as to thought, as to word, as to deed, and between these two let the wise choose aright."

Says James Darmesteter, the translator of the Zend-Avesta.

"There were two general ideas at the bottom of the Indo-Iranian religion; first, that there is a law in nature, and secondly, that there is a war in nature (*Sacred Books of the East*, IV., p. lvii).

The law in nature proves the wisdom of Ahura, who is therefore called Mazda the Wise. The war in nature is due to the intrusion of Ahriman into the creation of Ahura.

After death, according to the Zoroastrian doctrine, the soul must pass over *cinvato peretush*, i. e. the "accountant's bridge," where its future fate is decided. Evil doers fall into the power of Ahriman and are doomed to hell; the good enter *garô demâna*, the life of bliss; while those in whom good and evil are equal, remain in an intermediate state, the *Hamêstakâns* of the Pahlavi books, until the great judgment-day (called *âka*).

To characterise the noble spirit of the religion of Zarathuśtra, we quote the following formula which was in common use among the Persians and served as an introduction to every liturgic worship:[1]

"May Ahura be rejoiced! May Angrô be destroyed by those who do truly what is God's all-important will.

"I praise well-considered thoughts, well-spoken words, and well-done deeds. I embrace all good thoughts, good words, and good deeds; I reject all evil thoughts, evil words, and evil deeds.

"I give sacrifice and prayer unto you, O Ameshâ-Spentâ![2] even with the fulness of my thoughts, of my words, of my deeds, and of my heart: I give unto you even my own life.

"I recite the 'Praise of Holiness,' the *Ashem Vohu*.[3]

"'Holiness is the best of all good. Well is it for it, well is it for that holiness which is perfection of holiness!'

"I confess myself a worshipper of Mazda, a follower of Zarathustra, one who hates the devils (daêvas) and obeys the laws of Ahura."

We have little information concerning the origin of Zarathuśtra's dualism, but we can nevertheless reconstruct it, at least in rough outlines. For there are witnesses left, even to-day, of the historical past of

[1] Cf. *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXIII., p 22.

[2] The six *Ameshâ Spentâ* (the undying and well-doing ones) are what Christians might call archangels. Originally they had been seven, but the first and greatest among them, Ahura Mazda, came to overshadow the divinity of the other six. They remained powerful gods, but he was regarded as their father and creator. We read in *Yast*, XIX, 16, that they have one and the same thinking, one and the same speaking, one and the same doing, one and the same father and lord, who is Ahura Mazda.

At first the Ameshâ Spentâ were mere personifications of virtues, but later on they were entrusted with the government of the various domains of the universe. *Haurvatât* and *Ameretatât* (health and immortality) had charge of waters and trees. *Khshathrm Vairim* (perfect sovereignty), whose emblem as the fire of lighting was molten brass, was the master of metals. *Asha Vahita* (excellent holiness), the moral world order as symbolised by sacrifice and burnt-offering, ruled over the fire. *Spenta Armaiti* (divine piety) was the goddess of the earth, according to old traditions, since the Indo-Iranian era; and *Vohu Manô* (good thought) superintended the creation of animated life.

[3] Says Darmesteter: "The 'Ashem Vohu' is one of the holiest and most frequently recited prayers."

the old Persian religion. A sect called the Izedis, are the fossil representatives of the Devil-worship that preceded the purer notions of the Zoroastrian worship prevailing in the Zend-Avesta. Following the authority of a German traveller, Tylor says (*Primitive Culture*, Vol. II., p. 329):

"The Izedis or Yezidis, the so-called Devil-worshippers, still remain a numerous though oppressed people in Mesopotamia and adjacent countries. Their adoration of the sun and horror of defiling fire accord with the idea of a Persian origin of their religion (Persian "*ized*" = God), an origin underlying more superficial admixture of Christian and Moslem elements. This remarkable sect is distinguished by a special form of dualism. While recognising the existence of a Supreme Being, their peculiar reverence is given to Satan, chief of the angelic host, who now has the means of doing evil to mankind, and in his restoration will have the power of rewarding them. 'Will not Satan then reward the poor Izedis, who alone have never spoken ill of him, and have suffered so much for him?' Martyrdom for the rights of Satan! exclaims the German traveller, to whom an old white-bearded Devil-worshipper thus set forth the hopes of his religion."

This peculiar creed of the Izedis is in so far similar to the religion of Devil-worshipping savages as the recognition of the good powers is not entirely lacking, but it is, as it were, a merely negative element; the positive importance of goodness is not yet recognised.

It is probable that the Persians in prehistoric times were as much Devil-worshippers as are the Izedis. The daêvas, the deities of the irresistible forces of nature, were pacified with sacrifices. A recognition of the power of moral endeavor as represented in the personified virtues was the product of a slow development. Thus in Persia the Devil-worship of the daêvas yielded to the higher religion of God-worship; and this change marks a step of progress which brought it about that soon afterwards the Persians became one of the leading nations of the world.

THE OCTOBER MONIST.

The late Prof. George J. Romanes, "upon whose shoulders," Max Müller says, "the mantle of Darwin fell," considers, in the leading article, called *The Darwinism of Darwin, and of the Post-Darwinian Schools*, the question whether natural selection has been the *sole* or *but the chief* cause of the progressive modification of living forms. It will be remembered that Cope and the Neo-Lamarckians emphasise almost exclusively the influences of the environment in evolution, while Wallace and Weismann lay sole stress upon the principle of natural selection. Romanes thinks that Darwin's view, which admitted *all* factors, but laid chief stress on natural selection, will eventually prove the most accurate of all.

Dr. Paul Topinard, the distinguished French anthropologist, in the article *Man as an Animal*, being Part I. of a series on *Science and Faith*, attempts to determine man's place in animate Nature. His conclusion is that man is not a creature apart in the world, but is primarily an animal like all the others, the only difference being that he is adapted and perfected to intellectual life. The statement in this article that Professor Cope adopts the hypothesis that man is descended directly from the Lemurs without the intervention of the Anthropoid Apes, is not correct in the light of Professor Cope's actual discussions of the subject. (See his article on "The Genealogy of Man" in *The American Naturalist* for April, 1893.) Professor Cope had simply stated the probability that the Anthropoid Lemurs of the family Anaptomorphidæ are the ancestors of the Anthropoid Apes and man. Dr. Topinard was probably led to misunderstand his views on the subject by the fact that the group which includes the two latter families is termed the Anthropomorpha. For Professor Cope's exact and final views on the phylogeny of man, the reader may be referred to his forthcoming book on *The Primary Factors of Organic Evolution*.

Readers interested in pedagogy will find in the same number an important article by the renowned Italian criminologist, Prof. C. Lombroso, on *Some Applications of Criminal Anthropology to Practical Education*, where Professor Lombroso gives unmistakable and suggestive hints as to the method of discovering the criminal type in children and points out the measures which should be taken for the care of such patients. He also wisely draws attention to the practical limitations of his doctrine.

Students of natural logic will be especially interested in G. Ferrero's article on *Arrested Mentation*. By "arrested mentation" Ferrero understands that ingrained tendency of natural thought which leads us in our search for causes to stop short at phenomena falling under the notice of the senses, and not to go beyond the striking features of events for their real invisible causes. He gives a host of historical illustrations in support of his view, which is practically tantamount to a law of least effort for the mind.

An able defence of science, as opposed to the recent animadversions of Mr. Balfour, is made in the article *Naturalism*, by Prof. C. Lloyd Morgan of Bristol, England, who was said by an eminent naturalist to be "the shrewdest as well as the most logical critic in the field of Darwinian speculation." Professor Morgan claims that Mr. Balfour has totally misconceived the moral and religious upshot of the naturalistic tenets, asserting that any naturalistic interpretation of man's ethical and æsthetical ideals which tends in any measure to rob them of their worth and dignity is false in the highest degree. "I for one," he says, "should be sorry to believe that the noble deed, the unselfish action, the lofty ideal have no intrinsic worth and dignity, but shine only with a borrowed lustre, no matter what the source of that lustre." Yet "if it be asserted that the naturalist's conceptions of the worth of human endeavor are the spurious heritage of a creed that is not his, the counter-assertion may be made with at least equal plausibility, that the dignity of their supposed extrinsic source is but the reflected and hypostatised glory of their own inherent nobility."

The editor of *The Monist*, in the article *The New Orthodoxy* (which is an address delivered before the Pan-American Congress of Religion and Education), criticises the fashionable philosophy of the times as producing religious indifference and contributing to the spread of the agnostic doctrine of the vanity of all faith, scientific or religious, and formulates the demands of an orthodoxy which must be based on objective facts, sifted with critical judgment, and reached by objective criteria of truth. He sums up, "What we need most dearly is orthodoxy, but let our orthodoxy be genuine."

In a fervid and brilliant article on *The Fifth Gospel*, Dr. Woods Hutchinson, a rising author of Des Moines, Iowa, proclaims a new evangel—the Gospel according to Darwin. Instead of destroying the religious spirit, this Gospel, Dr. Hutchinson maintains, reanimates it and places it upon stronger foundations than ever before. The author's interpretations of the ethical outcome of the doctrine of evolution are aglow with genuine religious enthusiasm.

More than fifty-four books on philosophy, science, psychology, ethics, the history of religion, etc., are reviewed in the October

Monist, not to mention *résumés* of the contents of all the most prominent philosophical periodicals. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. Single copies, 50 cents; per annum, $2.00.)

NOTES.

The present number contains an article by the Abbé Charbonnel on the proposed repetition of the Chicago Parliament of Religions at Paris in the year 1900. We need scarcely add that we sympathise with the plan, and hope that the brotherly spirit in 1900 will be the same as it was in 1893; while with the experiences of the first Parliament, and having several years of preparation, the *mise en scène* can be considerably improved.

The first Parliament was a success mainly on account of the tact with which the Hon. C. C. Bonney managed its affairs. He possesses a peculiar talent for bringing together the most heterogeneous opinions on one platform and keeping them there in brotherly harmony. In the place of acrimonious debate, which reverberated through the centuries of the past, we had in those noted assemblages a friendly exchange of thought, and every one in presenting his views was confident that the truth should and would prevail in the end. We had glowing tributes to the grandeur of the Vêdas by a Hindu monk. The Roman Catholic Church set forth all the attractions of her uninterrupted traditions and the glorious beauties of her institutions. The most radical free thought that yearned for religious utterance was freely admitted. Buddhists of Ceylon and Japan in unpretentious modesty preached the nobility of compassion for all suffering beings, including the lowest grades of animal life. A representative of the Presbyterians, that church which is noted for its earnestness of conviction and the sternness of its dogmatology, and is imposing as a consistent system of rigid and clean-cut thought, stood at the helm and executed with remarkable ability the plan of the Congress. The Jews showed no animosity towards Christianity, but reminded the Christians that their Saviour had sprung from the Jewish race, and one of the most prominent rabbis of America concluded the Parliament with the Lord's Prayer.

* * *

Many of the daily papers construe the Pope's letter to Mgr. Satolli on religious conventions as hostile to religious parliaments. If that were so, how could he have spoken to Cardinal Gibbons as he did, and how would the Parisian clergy venture to propose a second Religious Parliament in 1900? Considering the popular misconception of the very idea of a religious parliament, which is often supposed to imply that all faiths are equally good, it is but natural that the Pope is anxious lest his flock be carried away with a mania for fraternising with those of other forms of belief. But remember, first, that the Pope speaks of Roman Catholic conventions only, not of religious parliaments, and secondly, that his advice is to admit dissenters even there, and to reply to their questions. Archbishop Ireland said, in an interview with a representative of the Associated Press: "The words of the Pope are in no manner a condemnation of parliaments of religions." As to the religious parliament to be held at Paris in 1900, he added: "It will no doubt lead to a great success. Catholics may well take part in it. Indeed, the Pope's letter has cleared the way for it by marking out the conditions under which it may be held even in punctilious Europe."

* * *

When some nine years ago *The Open Court* was first brought out, its founder planned nothing else than a Parliament of Religions in the shape of a periodical. The new periodical was intended to be an open court for the ventilation of religious problems, especially of the central problem,—the nature of man's soul and the ethical import of its proper comprehension. The founder of *The Open Court* is confident that if the several solutions are presented side by side, the truth will unfailingly come out in the end. The nature of a scientific solution of any problem is to let every possible conception be represented and investigated, to let them be tried in the furnace of criticism and tested by experience. That solution which covers the whole field and leaves no surd, which satisfies all the demands of theoretical considerations, and is at the same time serviceable in its practical application, will ultimately be victorious. In a word, the methods that are applied in science should be applied also to the solution of religious problems, and in this sense the religious tenet of *The Open Court* is called *The Religion of Science*.

THE OPEN COURT

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER. DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

$1.00 PER YEAR. **$0.50 FOR SIX MONTHS.**

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

CONTENTS OF NO. 426.